UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/710,795	08/03/2004	Gopesh Kumer	001-400	4794

37476 7590 05/25/2010
WHITE-WELKER & WELKER, LLC
P.O. BOX 199
CLEAR SPRING, MD 21722-0199

EXAMINER	
MEJIA, ANTHONY	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2451	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/25/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/710,795	KUMER, GOPESH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANTHONY MEJIA	2451	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/11/2009*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-19* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 10-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Acknowledgement is made that Claims 9 and 20 have been canceled; Claim 1 has been amended and pending with Claims 2-8 and 10-19.

2. Amendment to Claim 1 in response to examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st has been considered. The amendment obviates previously raised rejection, as such this objection hereby withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments, See Pages 11-16 of Remarks, filed **11 December 2009** have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

4. As per Claims 1 and 2, Applicant argues on Pages, 11-14 of Remarks, the present claimed invention in contrast does not require the use of a single telephone device, which limits the teachings in Lurie 1 to a single voice message. Applicant explicitly argues the present invention does not utilize or include a voice mail option as there is no connection formed or based in response to a voice mail as taught by Lurie 1.

As to the argument above, Examiner respectfully disagrees that the present claimed invention does not require the use of a single telephone device. Examiner directs Applicants to review line 4 of claim 1, which currently recites: "...to initiate a live conversation with a Service Provide via a ***telephone***..."

In response to applicant's arguments against Lurie 1, in that Lurie 1 is limited to a voice mail option. Applicant is reminded that individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Examiner relies on Faber to teach the steps of prompting said User to send an email to the Service Provider if the Internet platform determines said Service Provider is busy or unavailable (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.7) and providing input means, via said Internet Platform, for the User to create and send said email (pars [0009-0012], and [0027]). Specifically, in Fig. 7, at step 1320, not on Lurie 1 as argued by Applicant. Therefore the system of Faber/Lurie 1 is not limited to a voice mail option as alleged by applicants.

In further, on Pages 13-14 of Remarks, Applicants states that the previously amended Claim includes the limitation: "providing an Internet platform wherein said Internet Platform is an Internet-based system used to initiate a live conversation with a Service Provider via computer or other electronic mobile device over the Internet" which properly amends the claims to include the limitations argued by Applicant.

As to the argument above, Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the

amendments avoid such references or objections. In further, Examiner fails to see the amended limitations of "providing an Internet platform wherein said Internet Platform is an Internet-based system used to initiate a live conversation with a Service Provider via computer or other electronic mobile device over the Internet" in Claims 1 or 2 as disclosed by applicants.

5. As per Claims 18 and 19, Applicants argue in Pages 14-17 of Remarks, that the claimed invention in contrast to Lurie 1 does not require the use of a single telephone device, which limits the teachings of Lurie 1 to a single voice message. The present claimed invention does not utilize or include a voice mail option as there is no connection formed or based in response to a voice mail as taught by Lurie 1. In further, applicants argue Claims 18-19 that Penfield et al. (US 6,058,173) (referred herein after as Penfield) does not teach the claim limitations for: "extracting Service Provider per minute compensation rate from a System Database" or "determining total minutes said User can connect to a Service Provider until said User's account balance reaches zero". Applicants also argue that Penfield does not teach or suggest use within a system of multiple providers with carrying call rates or the use of various Service Providers and that the use of variable rates associated with a plurality of Service Providers is neither taught nor suggested for the billing system of Penfield to be used in combination.

As to the argument above, Examiner respectfully disagrees that the present claimed invention does not require the use of a single telephone device.

Examiner directs Applicants to review line 4 of claim 1, which currently recites: "...to initiate a live conversation with a Service Provide via a ***telephone***..."

In response to applicant's arguments against Lurie 1, in that Lurie 1 is limited to a voice mail option. Applicant is reminded that individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.,* 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

Examiner relies on Faber to teach the steps of prompting said User to send an email to the Service Provider if the Internet platform determines said Service Provider is busy or unavailable (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.7) and providing input means, via said Internet Platform, for the User to create and send said email (pars [0009-0012], and [0027]). Specifically, in Fig. 7, at step 1320, not on Lurie 1 as argued by Applicant. Therefore the system of Faber/Lurie 1 is not limited to a voice mail option as alleged by applicants.

Also, as to the arguments that Penfield et al. (US 6,058,173) (referred herein after as Penfield) does not teach the claim limitations for: "extracting Service Provider per minute compensation rate from a System Database" or "determining total minutes said User can connect to a Service Provider until said User's account balance reaches zero" and that Penfield does not teach or suggest use within a system of multiple providers with carrying call rates or the use of various Service Providers and that the use of variable rates associated with a plurality of Service Providers is neither taught nor suggested for the billing

system of Penfield to be used in combination. Examiner notes that said arguments have already been responded to in the previous response to Applicant (see pages 2-4 and 13-16 on Office Action dated 15 September 2009).

6. In further, Applicant argues that in Claims 18 and 19, there is not motivation to combine the teachings of Lurie 1 and Faber with Penfield and Olshansky.

In response to applicant's argument above that there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness may be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988), *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992), and *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007). In this case, Penfield for instance, discloses that there is a need to compute time remaining based upon an available balance and that there is also a need for a system that coordinates debiting functions for all calls for a given subscriber to ensure that the charges incurred do not exceed the available balance in the subscriber's account in real-time (col.1, lines 15-21 and 59-67).

Specification

7. The use of the trademarks COMPUSERVE®, Prodigy®, AMERICAN ONLINE®, AT&T®, Verizon®, MICROSOFT WIDOWS®, MICROSOFT INTERNET EXPLORER, NETSCAPE NAVIGATOR®, LYNX®, AND MOSAIC® has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

8. In the instant case, amendment section to the specification pars [0050-0052] is included as part of remarks, and is on the same page with applicant's arguments.

Therefore, applicant's amendment to the specification can not be properly processed as disclosed in 37 CFR 1.121 (h) requires that each section of an amendment document (e.g., amendment to the claims, **amendment to the specification**, replacement drawings, and remarks) MUST begin on a separate sheet. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-8, and 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber et al. (US 2002/0010608) (referred herein after as Faber) and in further view of Lurie et al. (US 7,289, 623) (referred herein after as Lurie 1).

Regarding Claim 1, Faber teaches a method of connecting two parties in real time, the method comprising:

providing an Internet platform Wherein said Internet platform is an Internet based system used to initiate a live conversation with a Service Provider via a telephone, computer, or other electronic mobile device over the Internet (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.1);

providing real-time communication between two or more parties via the Internet platform (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.1);

generating a pop-up window with information about said Service Provider pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.5);

checking to see if the Service Provider is available (par [0031], and *see* figs.7-9);

connecting said User with said Service Provider if available, via the Internet platform (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.13);

initiating a first call to the User (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.13),

receiving a first phone call by the User at his desired phone number from the Internet platform (pars[0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.13);

answering the first call by the User from the Internet platform (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.13),

initiating a second call to the Service Provider in response to the answered first call by the User, from the Internet platform (pars [0009-0012], [0027]);

answering the second call from the Internet platform by the Service Provider (pars [0009-0012], [0027]);

connecting the parties in a call via Internet platform (pars [0009-0012], [0027]);

tracking call information during the duration of the call by the Internet platform (pars [0009-0012], [0027] and *see* fig.12);

alerting said User if said Service Provider is not available (par [0031]), see figs.7-9); and

prompting said User to send an email to the Service Provider if the Internet platform determines said Service Provider is busy or unavailable (pars [0009-0012], [0027], and see fig.7);

providing input means, via said Internet Platform, for the User to create and send said email (pars [0009-0012], and [0027]); and

providing transaction settlement functions between two or more connected parties via the Internet platform (pars [0009-0012], and [0027]).

Faber does not explicitly teach the step of:

having a User click on an Internet -based icon to initiate a live conversation with a Service Provider.

However, Laurie in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for an on-line patch through including the step of:

having a User click on an Internet based icon to initiate a live conversation with a Service Provider (col.5, lines 11-23, and *see* fig.3).

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine all of the teachings of Faber and Laurie in order to enable a user to click on an icon to initiate a live conversation with a service provider. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make it more convenient for users to reach out to service providers.

Regarding Claim 2, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of an Internet platform having said pop-up window prompting said User to enter their phone number to make said connection providing means for making a connection and transferring speech and text (Faber: pars [0009-0012], and [0027], and *see* fig.1 and 13).

Regarding Claim 3, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and

Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of generating a message for said the User in said a pop-up window via the Internet platform when said Service Provider is not available (Faber: par [0031], see fig. 7-9).

Regarding Claim 4, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of allowing said Service Provider to enter their hours of availability to be visually displayed to Users via the Internet platform (Laurie: col.3, lines 57-62, and col.4, lines 39-45).

Regarding Claim 5, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of displaying said Service Provider's hours of availability within said a pop-up window via the Internet platform (Laurie: col.4, lines 39-45, 61-67, and col.5, lines 1-9, lines 43-54).

Regarding Claim 6, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 5 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection during the hours said Service

Provider is scheduled to be not available (Laurie: col.5, lines 43-54).

Regarding Claim 7, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 5 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach displaying in said a pop-up window via the Internet platform that said Service Provider is currently busy on another call if said Service Provider is currently on another system call (Laurie: col.4, lines 39-45, 61-67, and col.5, lines 1-9, lines 43-54).

Regarding Claim 8, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 7 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of further comprising denying said connection if a User tries to initiate a connection while said Service Provider is busy on another call (Faber: see figs.6-9).

Regarding Claim 10, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 5 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach the step of including displaying a compensation rate in a pop-up window via the Internet platform, based on a period of time, for each Service Provider (Faber: see fig,12).

Regarding Claim 11, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach the step of:

displaying a text link in a pop-up window via the Internet platform to a new pop up window displaying a Service Providers' profile and history of previous Users' feedback (Faber: *see* fig.6).

Regarding Claim 12, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teaches the step wherein the set of Service Providers is provided in response to a category selection via the Internet platform (Faber: *see* figs.3, 6, and 12).

Regarding Claim 13, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step after the connection has ended, prompting said User to provide feedback on said Service Provider regarding the quality of said Service Provider's service via the Internet platform (Faber: par [0035] and *see* fig.6).

Regarding Claim 14, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

setting up an account for the Service Providers; and

crediting the account for an amount based upon how long the connection is maintained (Faber: pars [0009-0012], and [0027], and see figs.4 and 12).

Regarding Claim 15, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

setting up an account for the Service Providers; and

crediting the account for an amount based upon how long the telephonic connection is maintained minus a fee (Faber: pars [0009-0012], and [0027], and see figs.4 and 12).

Regarding Claim 16, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

setting up a consumer account in the system for the User, wherein setting up the consumer account includes obtaining credit card information from the consumer (Faber: pars [0009-0012], and [0027], and *see* figs 4 and 12); and

allowing User to make a deposit to their consumer account (Faber: pars [0009-0012], and [0027], and *see* figs 4 and 12).

Regarding Claim 17, the combined teachings of Faber and Laurie teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie further teach wherein the method comprises the step of:

monitoring how long the telephonic connection is maintained between said User and said Service Provider (Faber: pars [0009-0012], and [0027], and *see* figs 4 and 12); and

deducting from said User consumer account an amount based upon how long the telephonic connection is maintained (Faber: pars [0009-0012], and [0027], and *see* figs 4 and 12).

9. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber in further view of Laurie 1 and in further view of Penfield and in further view of Olshansky (US 6,493,437).

Regarding Claim 18, the combined teachings of Faber in further view of Laurie 1 teach the method as described in claim 1 above. The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie 1 further teach further comprising:

extracting User real-time account balance information from a System Database (Faber: pars [0009-0012], [0034-0035], and see figs. 6-9, and 12);

extracting Service Provider per minute compensation rate from the System Database (Faber: pars [0009-0012], [0034-0035], and see figs. 6-9, and 12);

The combined teachings of Faber and Laurie 1 do not explicitly teach the step of:

determining total minutes said User can connect to said Service provider until said User's account balance reaches zero;

However, Penfield in a similar field of endeavor discloses a real-time rating and debating system including the steps of:

dividing the User account balance total by the Service provider per minute compensation rate (Penfield: abstract, col.1, lines 23-58, col.2, lines 1-11, col.3, lines 55-67, col.4, lines 1-7, and col.6, lines 6-11);

determining total minutes said User can connect to said Service provider until said User's account balance reaches zero (Penfield: abstract, col.1, lines 45-58, col.2, lines 1-11, col.3, lines 55-67, col.4, lines 1-7, and col.6, lines 6-11);

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Penfield in the Faber/Lurie 1 system in order to properly determine how long a user can connect to a service provider. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber/Lurie 1 and Penfield to ensure that all calls for a given subscriber does not exceed the available balance on a subscriber's account in real-time (Penfield: col.1, lines 36-43).

The combined teachings of Faber/Lurie 1 and Penfield do not explicitly teach the steps of:

displaying this information to said User textually in pop-up window the moment before said User connects to said Service provider; and

displaying a graphical timer in said pop-up window, once said User connects to said Service provider, begins counting down the minutes remaining for the User to be connected to the Service provider until said User's account balance is depleted and correspondingly their connection terminated.

However Olshansky in a similar field of endeavor discloses an advertising subsidized PC telephony including the steps of:

displaying this information to said User textually in pop-up window the moment before said User connects to said Service provider (Olshansky: col.1, lines 33-41, and col.5, lines 10-24); and

displaying a graphical timer in said pop-up window, once said User connects to said Service provider, begins counting down the minutes remaining for the User to be connected to the Service provider until said User's account balance is depleted and correspondingly their connection terminated (Olshansky: col.5, lines 26-31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Olshansky in the combined teachings of Faber/Lurie 1/Penfield to provide a graphical interface displaying real-time information of the user's account balance in real-time. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber/Lurie 1/Penfield/Olshansky to enhance the interaction of the user of the system by providing graphical-interface displaying information of the connection with the service provider in real-time.

9. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Faber in further view of Lurie 1 in further view of Penfield in further view of Olshansky and yet in further view of Ling (US 5,577,100) (referred herein after as Ling).

Regarding Claim 19, the combined teachings of Faber/Lurie 1/Penfield/Olshansky teach the method as described in claim 18 above. The combined teachings of Faber/Lurie 1/Penfield/Olshansky do not explicitly teach wherein the method comprises a hypertext link in a pop-up window via the Internet platform directing Users to make a deposit to their account.

However, Ling in a similar field of endeavor discloses a system and method for conducting electronic commerce transactions requiring micro payments including the step wherein a hypertext link in said pop-up window directing Users to make a deposit (e.g., add funds) to their account (par [0166], 275, fig.11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Ling in the combined teachings of Faber/Lurie 1/Penfield/Olshansky in order to be able to allow the users to have an easily accessible way of being able to add additional funds to their accounts. One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have been motivated to combine the teachings of Faber/Lurie 1/Penfield/Olshansky /Ling to help satisfy the demand and needs for people that require services such as expert advice from Service Providers that are available on the system.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Examiner has cited particular paragraphs, columns, and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY MEJIA whose telephone number

is (571)270-3630. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur 9:30AM-8:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John Follansbee/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451

/A.M./
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451